

Remarks/Arguments:

The independent claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moriyama (US 2004/0198430) in view of Dorenbosch (US 2004/0028009). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Prior to the pending Official Action, the claims were rejected by the combination of Moriyama and Jones. Applicants traverse that rejection. In response to that traversal, the rejection was changed to be the combination of Moriyama and Dorenbosch. Applicants' claim 1, however, includes a feature which is neither disclosed nor suggested by Dorenbosch, namely:

... wherein said first wired communication unit and said second wired communication unit begin to communicate ... after wireless data communication between said first wireless unit and said second wireless unit has stopped ...

... wherein said first wireless communication unit and said second wireless communication unit begin to communicate ... after wired data communication between said first wired unit and said second wired unit has stopped

The above claimed features of stopping wireless communication AND THEN having wired communication, or stopping wired communication AND THEN having wireless communication are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record. This feature is supported by the originally filed application at page 19, two lines from the bottom of the page, to page 20, line 5. No new matter has been added.

As stated above, Dorenbosch is completely different than the above quoted feature of Applicants' claims. Paragraph [0045] of Dorenbosch states:

While the new connection is established, the original connection must remain in operation (emphasis added).

Thus, in Dorenbosch, wireless communication and wired communication must occur simultaneously when transferring between wireless and wired communication.

Application No.: 10/529,620
Amendment Dated: December 28, 2010
Reply to Office Action of: September 8, 2010

MTS-3512US

As Applicants' above claimed feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.


Applicants' remaining independent claims, while not identical to claim 1, are also patentable over the art of record for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Applicants' remaining claims have also been rejected based on prior art. Those claims, however, are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable independent claims.

This application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia



Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/sh

Dated: December 28, 2010

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

1117427